



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/347,753	07/06/1999	CHRISTIAN R. LEHEW	1880	4263

7590 10/03/2003

MICHALIK & WYLIE PLLC
PMB 193
704 228TH AVE NE
SAMMAMISH, WA 98074

EXAMINER

NAJJAR, SALEH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2003

6
(remai)

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/347,753	07/06/1999	CHRISTIAN R. LEHEW	1880	4263

7590 09/17/2003

MICHALIK & WYLIE PLLC
14645 BEL-RED ROAD
SUITE 103
BELLEVUE, WA 98007

EXAMINER

NAJJAR, SALEH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 09/17/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/347,753

Applicant(s)

LEHEW ET AL.

Examiner

Saleh Najjar

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 1/12 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on November 19, 2002. Claims 1-3, 7-9, 15-18, 20, 22, 24-25, and 27 were amended. Claims 28-29 were newly added. Claims 1-29 are pending examination. Claims 1-29 represent program product and apparatus for automatic and transparent synchronization of server side state information with a client application.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CAR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-6, and 8-29 are rejected 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,226,752.

Gupta teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method and apparatus for authenticating users and establishing sessions between a client and application server (see abstract).

As to claim 1, Gupta teaches computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions, comprising:

at a browser hosted by a client application program, receiving a request from the client application program to access to a application server, the request providing information including a network location of that application server (see figs. 1-4; col. 11,

Art Unit: 2157

lines 35-50, Gupta discloses that a client accesses a application server through a click on a icon presented on a applet application);

accessing the application server page in response to the request from the client application program (applet); receiving information from the application server page; writing the information to a client storage (see col. 11-12, Gupta discloses that a client is redirected from the application server if not authenticated by using URL redirection and forwarding a cookie identifier to store at the client for forwarding to a login server);

providing a server (login server) with data corresponding to the information received from the application server page written into the client storage, the data indicating to the server that the browser is being hosted by the client application (see col. 11-13, Gupta discloses that client identification information is redirected through the client to the login server for authenticating the client); and

receiving state information directed to the client application from the server based on the data having been provided to the server (see col. 11-13, Gupta discloses that client session authentication information is sent to the client from the login server to be forwarded to the application server for validation).

Gupta does not explicitly teach the limitation of a "hidden web page". Gupta does teach that a click on a icon found on an applet accesses the application server, the applet downloaded previously to the client as an application to access a particular application server (see col. 11, line 44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Gupta by specifying the application server as the hidden web page since the same functionality of accessing a nonspecific application server is achieved.

As to claim 2, Gupta teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 1 having further computer-executable instructions comprising invoking the browser from the client application (see col. 11, Gupta discloses that an applet application program is provided to the client to access a application server).

As to claim 3, Gupta teaches the computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions of claim 1 wherein accessing the hidden web page (application server) includes passing data to the hidden web page (see col. 11-12, Gupta discloses

Art Unit: 2157

that client session information in the form of a cookie is forwarded to the application server).

As to claim 4, Gupta teaches the computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions of claim 3 wherein the data passed to the hidden web page includes time information indicative of a synchronization time with the server state information (see col. 11-12, Gupta teaches that time stamp information is embedded within the cookie at the client).

As to claim 5, Gupta teaches the computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions of claim 3 wherein receiving information from the hidden web page includes receiving at least some of the data passed thereto (see col. 11-13, Gupta discloses that session information along with a redirection URL is forwarded to the client).

As to claim 6, Gupta teaches the computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions of claim 1 wherein receiving state information from the server includes receiving data maintained at the server for synchronizing with data of the client browser (see col. 10-13).

As to claim 8, Gupta teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 6 having further computer-executable instructions for synchronizing the state information with data of the client application program (browser) (see col. 10-13, Gupta discloses that session information is updated or validated and has an associated valid time window).

As to claim 9, Gupta teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 1 having further computer-executable instructions for linking the state information to data of the client application program (see col. 10-13).

As to claims 10-11, Gupta teaches the limitation wherein the state information is represented as an image tag identifying a source of the state information or identifying an image tag identifying a registered media type (see col. 11-13, Gupta discloses that the web page presented to the client may have a logout icon when the client has a valid ongoing session).

As to claim 12, Gupta teaches the computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions of claim 1 wherein receiving state information from the server includes receiving a cookie written into a client-side storage(see col. 11-13).

As to claim 13, Gupta teaches the computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions of claim 1 wherein providing a server with data includes providing the server with a time stamp of a synchronization time of server state information (see col. 11-13).

As to claim 14, Gupta teaches the computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions of claim 1 wherein providing a server with data includes providing the server with a client identifier (see col. 10-13)

As to claim 15, Gupta teaches computer-readable medium of claim 1 having further computer-executable instructions comprising providing authentication information to the server (see col. 10-13).

Claims 16-29 do not teach or define any new limitations over claims 1-6, 8-15 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta further in view of Moshfeghi, U.S. Patent No. 6,476,833 (referred to hereafter as Mosh).

As to claim 7, Gupta teaches the computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions of claim 6.

Gupta fails to teach the claimed limitation wherein the data maintained at the server is financial data. Gupta does disclose a method and system where the application server contains any number of applications (see col. 10-13).

However, Mosh teaches a method and system for controlling browser functionality in the context of an application accessing a banking data (see col. 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Gupta in view of Mosh so that banking/financial institution is accessed for financial data. One would be motivated to do so since Gupta discloses a system where authentication and validation are important requirements for application server access).

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CAR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CAR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2157

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saleh Najjar whose telephone number is (703) 308-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:30 to 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Ario Etienne*, can be reached on (703) 308-7562.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600. The central official fax number for the group is (703) 872-9306.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Saleh Najjar', with a stylized, cursive script.

Saleh Najjar

Primary Examiner / Art Unit 2157